Applicant: David Shen Attorney's Docket No.: 18085-004001

Serial No.: 10/729,674

Filed: December 5, 2003

Page : 5 of 6

REMARKS

In view of the following remarks and the foregoing amendments, reconsideration and allowance are respectfully requested.

Claims 1-19 are pending at the time of this action, with Claims 1 and 12 being independent. Claims 1-10, 12-19 have been amended.

Claims 1-19 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement.

Claims 12-19 stand objected to because of informalities.

35 U.S.C. 112 – Claims 1-19

Independent claims 1 and 12 are patentable at least because these claims have been amended to contain subject matter described in the specification to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor had possession of the claimed invention at the time the application of filed. In particular, the language "said filters can be any filter types including all pass" has been removed from these claims. Hence, Applicant asks that the rejection to claims 1, 12 and their dependencies be withdrawn, and these claims be placed in condition for allowance.

Claim 2 is patentable at least because claim 2 has been amended to have a clear antecedent basis for "the receiver architecture." In particular, claim 2 now recites "the receiver comprises an architecture that is any of a superheterodyne architecture." Hence, the rejection to claim 2 should be withdrawn.

Claims 9 and 10 are patentable at least because these claims have been amended to have a clear antecedent basis for the "RF chip." Amended Claim 13 is patentable at least for not depending upon itself. Applicant asks that claims 9, 10 and 13 be allowed.

Objections – Claims 12-19

Claim 12 is patentable at least because the amendments to claim 12 correct the informalities. In particular, the period "." at line 9 of claim 12 has been removed. Hence, claim 12 and its dependencies are in condition for allowance.

Applicant: David Shen Attorney's Docket No.: 18085-004001

Serial No.: 10/729,674

: December 5, 2003 Filed

Page : 6 of 6

In addition, Applicant believes that no new search is necessitated by the amendments because the amendments are not necessary to distinguish the claims from prior art. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the amendments be entered.

Conclusion

In view of the amendments and remarks herein, the Applicant believes that Claims 1-19 are in condition for allowance and asks that these pending claims be allowed. The foregoing comments made with respect to the positions taken by the Examiner are not to be construed as acquiescence with other positions of the Examiner that have not been explicitly contested. Accordingly, the arguments for patentability of a claim should not be construed as implying that there are not other valid reasons for patentability of that claims or other claims.

Please apply any charges or credits to Deposit Account No. 06-1050.

Respectfully submitted,

wight U. Thompson

Reg. No. 53,688

Fish & Richardson P.C.

1425 K Street, N.W.

11th Floor

Washington, DC 20005-3500

Telephone: (202) 783-5070

Facsimile: (202) 783-2331

40419781.doc